

**REMARKS****I. Introduction**

Claims 1-26 are pending in the above application.

Claims 12, 21 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 2.

Claims 1-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Claims 1, 4, 13, 18 and 22 are independent claims.

**II. Amendments**

Claims 12, 21 and 26 have been amended to correspond with their respective base claims.

Accordingly, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 2 is believed to be moot.

No new matter has been added.

**III. Prior Art Rejections**

A. Claims 1-8, 11-13 and 17-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Yang (U.S. Pat. 6,069,877) in view of Willins et al. (U.S. Pub. 2001/0052083).

Obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. *Ecolochem Inc. v. Southern California Edison Co.*, 227 F.3d 1361, 56 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) 1065 (Fed. Cir. 2000); *In re Dembiczak*, 175 F.3d 994, 999, 50 U.S.P.Q.2D (BNA) 1614, 1617 (Fed. Cir. 1999); *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21

U.S. Serial No.: ~~4,986,982~~

U.S.P.Q.2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992); and *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988). See also MPEP 2143.01.

Neither Yang nor Willins, taken alone or in combination disclose or suggest all of the limitations set forth in any of independent claims 1, 4, 13, 18 or 22. Yang does not disclose to use a KDC (key distribution center). Yang only detects a duplicate request when the original requester is logged on. See, Fig. 6. There is no ticket in Yang associated with a KDC. Willins merely discloses to use a Kerberos approach to issuing printed tickets, e.g. access tickets printed on an airline ticket. See, Willins, ¶ 97. Willins does not disclose or suggest an expiration time of the ticket which is issued. Willins merely discloses to contain a timestamp in the request for a ticket. See, Willins, ¶ 93.

Accordingly, the combination of Yang and Willins, taken alone or in combination, does not render any of claims 1, 4, 13, 18 or 22 unpatentable. Furthermore, the combination of Yang and Willins also does not render claims 2-3 and 11, which depend on claim 1; claims 5-8 and 12, which depend on claim 4; claim 17, which depends on claims 13; claims 19-21 and 26, which depends on claims 18; nor claims 23 which depends on claim 22, unpatentable.

B. Claims 9-10 and 14-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Yang in view of Willins in view of Tung et al. (Public Key Cryptography for Initial Authentication in Kerberos, December 10, 2001, Internet Draft).

The addition of Tung does not cure the deficiencies of the combination of Yang and Willins. Tung merely discloses a general Kerberos application. The Office action also does not rely on Tung to reject independent claims 1, 4, 13, 18 or 22. Accordingly, the combination of

U.S. Serial No.: ~~2153231300~~

Yang, Willins and Tung does not render claims 9-10, which depend on claims 4, nor claims 14-16, which depend on claim 13, unpatentable.


#### IV. Conclusion

Having fully responded to the Office action, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance. Should any issues arise that prevent early allowance of the above application, the examiner is invited contact the undersigned to resolve such issues.

To the extent an extension of time is needed for consideration of this response, Applicant hereby request such extension and, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge deposit account number 502117 for any fees associated therewith.

Date: 1/4/06

Respectfully submitted,

By:   
Lawrence T. Cullen  
Reg. No.: 44,489

Motorola Connected Home Solutions  
101 Tournament Drive  
Horsham, PA 19044  
(215) 323-1797